REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-15, 17-23, and 25-52 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 17 and 29 are independent claims.

Amendments

Claims 16 and 24 has been cancelled from the present application.

Claims 9-12, 14, 21-23, 25, 27, 28, 33, 37, 40, 41, 43, and 46-52 have been amended to more clearly define the invention.

Regarding Claim objections – 35 USC 112

Claim 24 has been cancelled from the application. Claims 25-27, as amended, are directly or indirectly dependent from claim 23.

Regarding 35 USC 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 7-10, and 16-22 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim (US Patent No. 6,943,907).

Independent claim 1 defines a printer including an interface. The printer is configured to receive documents to be printed from a computer system.

The printer is configured to receive, via the interface, an input from a user. The input is indicative of a print command. The printer then sends to the computer system a print request. Next, a document to be printed is received from the computer system and in response to the print request. Finally, the printer prints the document.

Kim discloses a printer in a printer system, and a method for printing a confidential document. A printer driver 15a executes on a user computer 10. The printer driver 15a provides a print type menu 15d on the screen 18a of a display device 18 of the user computer 10. The print type menu enables a user to select either general printing or confidential printing with respect to a document file to be printed. When confidential printing was selected, the user is requested to input an arbitrary secret code through the screen 18a.

A print command is received by input device 17. Upon receipt of the print command, the printer driver 15a transfers the selected print type information and a print data file to the printer 30.

The printer 30 temporarily stores the print type information and the print data file in memory device 34 until the secret code is input through an input panel 33 of the printer.

When the secret code set in the print type information is the same as the secret code input through the input panel 33, an image corresponding to the print data is printed to paper.

In Kim, the input received from the user through an interface of the printer is not indicative of a print command. In Kim the print command is input through input device 17 of the user computer 10.

Furthermore, in Kim a print request is not sent from the printer to the user computer. In Kim the selected print type information and a print data file are sent from the user computer 10 to the printer 30. There is no disclosure in Kim of any communication from the printer 30 to the user computer 10. All communication is from one of the user computers 10 to the printer 30.

In view of the foregoing it is submitted that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Kim. Claim 17 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus Claim 1. It is further submitted that Claim 17, and Claims 2-15, 18-23, 25-28 and 47-52 which are directly or indirectly dependent on either Claim 1 or Claim 17, are allowable for at least the same reasons already presented with regards to Claim 1.

Claim 16 has been cancelled.

Regarding 35 USC 103 Rejections

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Saito et al. (US 5,731,829).

Claims 4-5, 47-48 and 50 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Saito et al. and further in view of Minemoto et al. (US 6,188,569).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Saito et al., further in view of Minemoto et al., and further in view of Vaghi (US 6,188,569).

Claims 11, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Braun et al. (US Publication Number 2003/0063064).

Claim 12-14, and 25-27 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Braun et al., and further in view of Sesek et al. (US Publication No. 2004/0085568).

Claim 15 and 28 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Braun et al., and further in view of Rich (US 6,200,025).

Claim 49 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Saito et al., further in view of Minemoto et al., and further in view of Mcleod et al. (US 6,356,901).

Claim 51 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Saito et al., further in view of Minemoto et al., and further in view of Lee (US 5,752,049).

As Kim fails to disclose the features set out above in relation to Claim 1, it is submitted that the rejected claims above are allowable for at least the reasons presented with regards to Claim 1 as all the rejected claims above include at least those features.

Claims 29, 37 and 40 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Tanaka et al. (US Publication No. 2001/0048534).

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Tanaka et al., in further view of Braun et al.

Claims 30-32 and 41-42 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Tanaka et al., and further in view of Sesek et al.

Claims 34-36 and 43-45 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Tanaka et al., in further view of Braun et al., and in further view of Sesek et al.

Claims 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Tanaka et al., and further in view of Donnelly et al. (US 6,100,885).

Claim 46 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Tanaka et al., further in view of Sesek et al., and further in view of Donnelly et al.

Independent Claim 29 defines a printer including an interface. The printer is configured to receive, via the interface, input from a user indicative of a print command. A print request is then sent to a computer system. In response to the print request a document to be printed is received from the computer system. The printer prints the document in response to the input, without a dialog box requiring further input from the user being displayed by the computer system or the printer.

In Kim, the input received from the user through an interface of the printer is not indicative of a print command. Furthermore, in Kim a print request is not sent from the printer to the user computer.

Yet further, and as acknowledged by the Examiner, Kim fails to show a printer wherein the document is printed in response to the input without a dialog box requiring further input from the user being displayed by the computer system or the printer. In fact,

such would be in direct conflict with the teachings of Kim, as the system of Kim is reliant on the further input by the user of the secret code to operate.

It is therefore not permissible to modify the teachings of Kim with that of Tanaka as such is in conflict with the teachings of Kim. Claim 29 is therefore allowable over the cited references.

Claims 30 to 46 are directly or indirectly dependent on Claim 29, and are allowable for at least the reasons presented above in relation to Claim 29.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:

_____
Kia Silverbrook

_____
Paul Lapstun

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
              393 Darling Street
              Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762